

The Court ODR Podcast, Episode 16

Colin Rule interviews Judge Stacy Guillon

08/24/2026

Colin Rule: [00:00:00] Welcome, everyone, to the next episode of the Court ODR podcast. My name is Colin Rule. I'm CEO of ODR.com, and I am delighted today to be joined by my friend Stacy, who is a district court judge in the 23rd Judicial District in the state of Colorado. She is an experienced arbitrator and mediator, and she has been a neutral since 2021. But she also is a proud alum of Stanford Law School, right up the road.

So Stacy, thank you so much for being with me here today.

Stacy Guillon: Thank you, Colin. It's my pleasure.

Colin Rule: [00:00:28] We should also say, the way that we met each other in the first place is through your mom, Becky, who many, many people know, not only from her time on the Supreme Court in Colorado, but as the founder of IAALS, the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System. And I think you've done some work with IAALS over the years as well, right?

Stacy Guillon: That's right.

Colin Rule: Yeah. So I wanna talk to you today about the future of the judiciary and AI and everything that's coming together. You and I have had some really interesting conversations about how technology is affecting the work of judges. So why don't you just talk a little bit about your practice, and how you found your way to your judgeship?

Stacy Guillon: [00:01:03] Sure. So when I came out of law school, I did a clerkship here in Colorado, and then went to a law firm — an old, historic Denver law firm that had been around for about 100 years here in Denver. Since then it has joined forces with a national and then an international law firm, so it's much, much bigger.

But I wanted to do litigation, and I had some particular interest areas, but I was very attracted to the firm because it was general. So I got pretty diverse litigation experience at the firm, and a lot of courtroom experience, which, you know, that cannot be taken for granted by a young lawyer.

After having done that for a number of years, I then helped to co-found an arbitration and mediation boutique based here in Denver, though we did arbitrations and mediations region-wide and, to a certain extent, across the country. So I also got pretty diverse experience in that field as well, doing all types of cases, primarily commercial cases, in both arbitration and mediation.

And then I came onto the district court bench here in Colorado just a little over a year ago, where I have a civil docket.

Colin Rule: [00:02:13] It's amazing, because you've had your hands on so many parts of the legal elephant. You have the cred, 'cause you've been in the trenches as a litigator, plus you've seen it from the arbitration and mediation side, and now you see it from the judge side.

So one of the first questions I want to ask you is: being an arbitrator and a mediator, you take a certain perspective on some of these cases, and now you're a judge. What are your thoughts on the differences in the roles?

Stacy Guillon: [00:02:39] Ooh, the differences in the roles are — I mean, each of these three roles, I will say generally: one as a litigator, one as a private neutral, an arbitrator and mediator, and then one as a judge, are very, very different.

I'm so grateful for the arbitration and mediation experience coming onto the bench, because I think it was great training. However, the way that cases are handled is just so different in each role. So in that respect, I suppose I'll let you guide me. Which of the differences between those roles do you wanna talk about?

Colin Rule: [00:03:10] So I think a lot of arbitrators — I mean, I work with a lot of arbitrators who were former judges, right? And I think arbitrators who come from just the litigation practice don't think about disputes the same way that judges who become arbitrators do.

Some of the judges who become arbitrators — the joke is that they arbitrate with a gavel, because you have a lot of credibility from your time on the bench. And obviously when you are a judge, you are imbued with a lot of civic responsibility. This is public service. Whereas an arbitrator, you're being invited in by the parties, to a certain extent, due to your expertise and your neutrality. But the task of looking at a case and evaluating the evidence and rendering a decision is the same.

So that was kind of what I was trying to get at, and the reason why I'm asking the question is because obviously technology is taking over in dispute resolution. We now have AI

arbitrators, we have AI mediators, we have AI ombuds, we have AI coaches, and they're growing very, very quickly. And we haven't really yet seen that on the bench, but I think it's coming. So I kind of want you to talk about what your perspective was as an arbitrator and what your perspective is as a judge, and then maybe we can glide that into the technology conversation in a minute.

Stacy Guillon: [00:04:20] Yes, absolutely. So I do think you make an interesting observation here about the difference between arbitrators with judicial backgrounds and arbitrators who come directly from private practice, or who are engaged as arbitrators while they maintain a private practice as litigators. Which is to say that, of course, the place where they spent most of their careers significantly informs how they arbitrate.

I think there are a lot of judges who handle arbitrations much like they would have handled cases when they were on the bench. And then there are arbitrators who are litigators who handle cases much like judges before whom they appeared handled their cases. But there are small groups on both sides — and I would say maybe more often litigators than judges, but without any sort of derision to either side, because I do think there are really excellent examples of this in both of those camps.

Which is to say: arbitration creates a lot of space for innovation.

Colin Rule: Hmm.

Stacy Guillon: [00:05:18] The rules are a lot more flexible, and the process is much less rigid. That is, when the arbitrator can get with the parties and figure out what makes the most sense for this case, there is an opportunity to tailor-make a process in a way that is not available in court.

Colin Rule: Fascinating.

Stacy Guillon: [00:05:37] As a judge, I have some flexibility, but the civil rules are what they are, and there's also a rhythm that I need to follow, because I have so many cases at one time that I'm not as available to do these sort of handcrafted solutions for each case.

Colin Rule: [00:05:55] I'm sorry — finish what you were gonna say.

Stacy Guillon: [00:05:56] I mean, I think it segues very nicely into what you're talking about with respect to technology, because what arbitrators and mediators and judges are doing with technology in adjudicating cases really depends on the individual arbitrator's or the individual judge's willingness to innovate.

In my experience so far, there has been no sort of top-down mandate of "you shall use this kind of technology," especially cutting-edge technology. You know, you must use email, but other than that — I have a software that I use through which I receive my filings as a judge. But other than that, what a judicial officer or an arbitrator wants to use, technology-wise, is really up to them. So how innovative they are has a significant impact on the technology that they're using case to case.

Colin Rule: [00:06:50] Yeah. This raises a fascinating point for me. I'm not an arbitrator, I'm a mediator — everything I've done has been on the mediator side, but I built a lot of software for arbitration. Obviously we're part of the American Arbitration Association, and when I first learned about the arbitration process, I learned about procedural orders at the beginning, and I thought, "Well, this is boring. It's gotta be the same thing every time. It's kinda cookie cutter." But as you say, it is an opportunity for innovation.

Stacy Guillon: Yes.

Colin Rule: [00:07:15] The beauty of dispute resolution is we can be very creative in designing a process. As a mediator, I'm there to assist the parties in their negotiation, and if they decide they wanna play a game of checkers and whoever wins gets the money — c'est la vie, right? As long as they're bought in and there's transparency.

And I think the same is true somewhat in arbitration. There were a lot of things that I assumed were set in stone about arbitration, and the more I learned about it, the more I realized, no, all of this is negotiable. A lot of people presume that arbitration is confidential. Well, it is if the parties agree that it is. But again, it has to do with their agreement.

Now, I can see from a judge's perspective, you don't have that same level of blank piece of paper — like, "How do you guys wanna resolve this? Let's come up with a process." You're sort of locked into a process that's prescribed by the court. And also your volumes are so much higher, too, right? How does your case volume as an arbitrator compare to your case volume as a judge?

Stacy Guillon: [00:08:11] Oh, I mean, magnitudes — huge magnitudes. You know, I carry hundreds of cases as a civil judge, and the Triple A would absolutely not allow that in arbitration.

Colin Rule: [00:08:23] So now let's get to the technology piece, 'cause you did allude to that. There are certain technology tools that you're provided in the court to manage your caseload, but again, I imagine they're pretty much set in stone, as the process is kind of set in stone. So talk about that a little bit.

Stacy Guillon: [00:08:38] Yeah. So there are some things, like in any workplace, where there's a sort of entity-wide piece of software that we use to communicate information. I have an email account that I use for internal communications. But most of the external information that I'm getting for a given case is coming through our e-filing system.

And that is statewide, for every case. That is how things are filed — whether that's a self-represented litigant who is taking a filing to the help desk downstairs and giving it to the clerk's office, and that's being uploaded into the system, or whether that's an attorney who's e-filing because the attorney has a login to this particular system, and they can just sort of input documents directly into it.

Colin Rule: Right.

Stacy Guillon: [00:09:24] That is, and has been, the sort of way of things in Colorado, though we've progressively increased to more and more e-filing, and now that's really all we do. But every judge in Colorado has the same system that I have. And then we all have access to Westlaw, including some of Westlaw's AI features, though not all of them.

Those are really the sort of staples of the software that we're provided, in addition to Microsoft Word and basic things like that. But in terms of technological communication and more advanced processing, those are the three buckets.

Colin Rule: [00:10:00] Well, I just finished a project working with an arbitrator who's a good friend of mine, who's based in the US but recently just moved back to Europe. We used AI and vibe coding to build a new case flow for her, because she was dealing with certain kinds of cases and she wanted to gather the information in a certain way and then share it with the parties progressively, where she could come in and vet it first and then open it more widely.

The power of these AI-assisted coding tools — it's almost like jazz. You can just say, "Well, how about we make it work this way?" And then you go wave your magic wand, and then it works. That is a very, very difficult thing to do when you're building technology tools which are, A, publicly funded, and B, for the entire state. So making changes to a big system like that is quite, quite difficult to do. I mean, it's a huge multi-year project. So that, I imagine, is another difference between being a private practitioner and a judge.

Stacy Guillon: [00:10:52] Yes, huge difference. As a private practitioner — when I was an arbitrator and a mediator, that's what I was doing when ChatGPT sort of came onto the public scene and all of us started thinking about AI in a very different way. So I don't have a lot of experience with it as a litigator, though I try to make it my business to understand at least some of what's going on with respect to AI in law firms.

When I was in the mediation and arbitration shop, we were experimenting with a lot of AI. We were piloting different software. We were using it in different ways. We were really trying to be pretty cutting edge in terms of how we could do it, and that was facilitated by two things.

One is, there was no bureaucracy. I had a couple of partners, and we all worked together to try to figure out what solutions made the most sense for us. But also because, within an arbitration or within a mediation, those are creatures of contract. And so when I went to the parties and said, "Here's what I want to do, and here's why I think it benefits you and it benefits me, and I'm gonna be transparent about it," I could then feel comfortable moving forward using AI in a thoughtful way, in compliance with a variety of guidelines that existed at the time and continue to persist. I certainly don't mean to diminish any of that, but it was feasible.

Within the judiciary, of course, a lot of the considerations are the same, right? What we care about is quality of the output, we care about confidentiality. But then on the logistical side, it is night and day, because the amount of data that we deal with and the platform on which we receive that data is — I mean, it's a little overwhelming.

Colin Rule: Right.

Stacy Guillon: [00:12:35] And then you have judicial officers statewide who are all trying to do different things. So trying to figure out a platform that serves so many different functions all at the same time...

Colin Rule: [00:12:46] Well, obviously we live in a society that's being transformed by AI, and I know your years in the litigation trenches were all pre-, really, the LLM revolution. But certainly that's changing law big time, right? You see all of these huge multi-billion-dollar efforts to bring AI and technology into law firms, and it's transforming dispute resolution, obviously. And I'm kind of on the front line of that, in terms of arbitrators and mediators trying to wrap their heads around: well, what's the appropriate role of AI in these processes, and what do parties expect, and what guardrails do we need to put on it?

But both of those fields — the law and dispute resolution — are in the private sector, so they're subject to competitive pressure. And obviously practitioners wanna be on the bleeding edge, 'cause you don't wanna get left behind. The ABA has put out professional rules that say lawyers have to be smart about how to utilize these tools, because eventually you're not gonna be able to charge parties for 10 hours of work to write a prenup if you could do it with AI in an hour. It's professionally irresponsible not to understand that.

But obviously the courts are a different beast, right? The courts are not subject to competitive pressure. If you don't like the service you're getting from the courts, you can't storm out in a huff and go to the other court. There's really one system there. And I've spent a lot of time working with judges, working with court administrators, working with clerks, and I have yet to meet anyone in the courts that has a malevolent bone in their body. Everyone is engaged in public service. But they aren't subject to the same competitive pressures of trying to stay ahead of the competitor that's nipping at your heels, so you have to continually innovate.

I think about some of these courts — it's sort of like drinking from a fire hose. Every day there's new cases that are pouring in the door, and the legislature is continuing to cut budgets, and it's like, "Wow, how are we gonna deal with this?" Now especially when the filers are using AI and technology to file these cases. So their ability to file cases is being streamlined by AI, but the courts haven't yet put the technology in place to respond with technology. It's a very human-powered process.

Stacy Guillon: [00:14:49] Yes. I think you have some really interesting insights there, because I agree so much — you're exactly right. There is no sort of commercial competition that incentivizes courts to keep up as technology goes.

However, I think you are also right that the people that I have met in the judiciary are extremely public-service minded. They really wanna do a good job. And so the level of pressure that I feel, and the level of pressure that I think my colleagues feel, to do a really good job is certainly as much as, if not more than, I've felt in my previous roles. That pressure may have resulted from some commercial competition in other places, but the pressure exists nonetheless within the judiciary. And it really is pressure to do a good job — but it's pressure to do a good job under, sort of, to do more with less.

Because as you know, filings — and certainly my jurisdiction is no exception — civil filings have been increasing a lot here in my jurisdiction. And as I understand it from the National Center for State Courts and some other sources, there are other jurisdictions experiencing the same thing. But we are not getting new judges by the day. So trying to figure out how to do a really good job, give each case the attention that it needs, not increase the backlog and increase the time to disposition, has certainly motivated me to think a lot about what resources we have, or what resources we could have.

And like I say, the pressure comes from different sources, but I think the result is the same: that there is a lot of thought going into what does this mean, and is technology part of the answer?

Colin Rule: [00:16:37] Well, I've actually had conversations with judges who have said to me that delay is actually part of the court process. It's not like we're trying to make widgets. And I think they say 98% of civil cases filed in the US courts resolve before they actually get to an actual hearing in front of a judge. So part of that is strategic delay.

But technology — and I think in the private sector, too — a lot of litigants, a lot of customers of the judicial system, they want it wrapped up. It's like, "Come on, let's go. Why can't I resolve this 24/7?" They're having expectations that are set for them based on their interactions with other service providers. So when they come to the courts, they bring that in. "Well, why can't I file this at midnight? Why isn't there a 1-800 number? Why can't I get an AI to analyze my filing and tell me if it's incomplete?" So it's a tricky thing when the courts are not designed to work that way.

Stacy Guillon: [00:17:35] And as much as I think that there are certain forms of delay that can be beneficial to parties — I think about the litigation process, sometimes the ball's in my court and sometimes it's in their court. And for the duration of discovery, unless something is going sideways, the ball's kind of in the litigants' court, and they need some time to do that. And giving them maximum pressure by setting the earliest possible trial date is not necessarily in the parties' best interest there.

Colin Rule: Right.

Stacy Guillon: [00:18:01] Even if I could set trial within mere months of filing, I'm not sure that that would be better for anybody. That said, I am very cognizant — and I fear that you could ask any of the parties before me — that a lot of the delay that my docket creates is bad for the parties. And I think sometimes it incentivizes settlement, but sometimes for the wrong reasons, right?

When I was a mediator, I came to mediation in part because I was working very closely with a former judge, but also with a very experienced trial lawyer who has had a long career with the legal system. We would hear a lot of lawyers counsel their clients, "Well, you should settle, because this case is gonna take a year and a half, and you're gonna be miserable the whole time." And they would say stuff like, "You never know what the judge is gonna do. The judges are unpredictable, or the juries are unpredictable." Or, "Here are the problems with the legal system, and because the legal system is bad, that should incentivize you to settle."

And I always hated hearing that. I am very cognizant that the legal system is not perfect. I hope that we will continue to make it better. And meanwhile, I really am concerned about things that I am doing that create the wrong kind of pressure for litigants to settle.

Colin Rule: Right, right.

Stacy Guillon: [00:19:20] I am hopeful that I can decrease my time to disposition, so somebody isn't sitting before a mediator thinking, "Oh my gosh, we're gonna file motion after motion and not get an order for months on end, and we're not gonna go to trial for 18 months" — and all of the things that I heard said in mediations.

All of this to say: I am very conscious that the fact that I have so many cases, despite the very long hours that I work, means I create delay for the parties that is not good for them.

Colin Rule: [00:19:48] Yeah, yeah, you raise so many interesting points. I mean, again, as someone who's mediated a bunch of cases in judges' chambers — like, I'm in small claims and the judge or the magistrate says, "Go with that guy" — I must say, I do play up the lack of satisfaction that can come out of the formal court process, because I wanna incentivize the parties to settle.

So I had cases where parties would come in with a big manila file folder filled with timestamped photos of the neighbor's dog pooping in their rose bushes, and they're like, "Well, when the magistrate sees these photos..." And I would say, "Look, let me break this to you. They're not gonna look at your folder. This is a small claims court. They're gonna ask you three questions. They're not even gonna give you a decision today — it's gonna get mailed to you in two weeks. So sitting in this room, we all have the information here. We can come up with a resolution that's gonna be much more informed."

And I don't think those bad old days of dispute resolvers kind of badmouthing the courts and talking about all the delays — I do think it's hand in glove, and I think there's a synergistic relationship between dispute resolution and the good work that judges do. But there's just a practical consideration in terms of how much bandwidth a judge has for each individual case. And I think that is something that I play up as a mediator, to say, "Hey, we can sit here as long as we want to try and work this out, and we'll look at all the photos in your file folder." But that's not gonna happen in the judicial process.

Stacy Guillon: [00:21:09] Yes, you're exactly right. And making an informed decision in a mediation is so important — and having somebody understand that the judicial process, as much as I hate to say it, is slow. We have finite resources, and I have to be very conscious when I'm spending time with a case about how much time I can spend.

I had probably been a judge for maybe a week. I had a wonderful mentor and judicial colleague, and he worked with me closely in my first week, and until he retired, and I hope he will continue to do so yet still. But within my first week he said to me, "I know what your

problem's gonna be, Stacy. Your problem's gonna be that you want to write an appellate opinion about everything."

And it's true. I'm getting better, but given my way, I would spend a huge number of hours on every single motion, to make 105% sure that it's right. I would pour through every line, many times, of every exhibit. But the reality is that if I do that, a whole bunch of other cases suffer. A whole bunch of other cases get delayed.

Colin Rule: The perfect is the enemy of the good.

Stacy Guillon: Exactly. Net-net, I cannot justify doing that. So you're not wrong to say the court can't go line by line on every single exhibit that's filed. The court's relying on counsel to highlight what's most important. And in small claims court, the court's gonna ask the parties to try to figure out efficiently what really the issue is, without turning over every stone — because we can't.

Colin Rule: [00:22:47] Well, and this is a great segue into the topic that I want to wrap up on, which is, obviously, AI does have the time to do that, right? You can have a \$5 dispute and an AI will happily write you a 20-page reasoned award and evaluate every single piece of evidence. The humans just simply can't do that. You can't find an arbitrator who would be willing to do that at an appropriate price point, and certainly judges don't have the time to go through and provide that level of analysis in a low-dollar-value civil case.

So, as I say, the rules of professional conduct for lawyers are evolving in response to the capabilities of AI, and we both know that that's happening on the judge side as well. There are new tools and conversations happening all the time: how can we bring these tools into the court? Plus we also have AI-generated filings, and AI-generated evidence, and AI-generated motions. And to have humans evaluating the product of AI is just an unfair fight, because an AI can turn out 100 pages in two minutes, and it takes two hours for a human to read through all of that. So what's your kind of sense of where this is all headed?

Stacy Guillon: [00:23:54] I think especially within the judiciary — I used to travel all over and talk about AI and arbitration, and in that context I got to work with other arbitrators, but I also got to work a lot with businesses. And when I think about the progress that even a year ago those businesses had made in integrating AI into so many of their processes, including in the legal departments, and I compare that to where the judiciary is: the judiciary is just starting out on the AI journey, in my experience.

And so I think the factors that have clearly revealed themselves are that you're exactly right. I, as a judge personally — and I think I can speak for more judges than myself in saying this — we are seeing AI-generated filings. And some of them are very well done

and you'd never know the difference, and some of them, it's very obvious that they were AI-generated.

Colin Rule: Sure. I feel that way as a professor when I get my papers.

Stacy Guillon: [00:24:46] That's right. In a certain way, I see AI as a potential tool to increase access to justice. When I think about a self-represented litigant: do I think that there are self-represented litigants in my courtroom who feel more comfortable proceeding through the process because they have an AI tool at their disposal? Yeah, absolutely I do.

And sometimes that AI tool helps them, and sometimes that AI tool confuses matters, but these tools, I think, are going to improve as well. But even now, with user knowledge about how to employ them and where their shortcomings are and what tools serve which purposes, there's a lot of opportunity for litigants — whether self-represented or whether litigators — to use those tools to improve their work product or improve the efficiency of their work, in huge numbers right now.

And I think as a result what we're going to see is just more filings. I don't see a way around that personally. A lot of the reading that I have done has revealed to me that there are some smart people out there who are saying lawyers aren't going anywhere — it's just that they may have to have more clients in order to make the same amount of money, because they're just gonna have to do less on each case, simply because, assisted by AI, they can be a lot more efficient.

And, like I say, from an access to justice perspective, that's potentially a great thing. There's huge unmet legal need by people who have legal problems but they can't afford a lawyer. If there are lawyers — and maybe it'll be all lawyers, maybe it'll be a specific sector of lawyers — who can provide some of those services less expensively because they're using AI to create efficiencies, from an access to justice perspective, that's very promising.

But it means that there's likely more litigation, or more filings per case, or whatever it may mean — and the resources in the judiciary, as far as I can see, are going to remain pretty static in terms of human capital.

[00:26:42] So then the question is: how can those humans in the judiciary decide more cases, and decide more motions, with the same number? You know, there are judges who are gonna work harder and all of this thing — there's a little bit of play here. But generally speaking, with the same amount of resources, I think that we as a judiciary are gonna have to do some really good thinking about how to leverage some of these tools to improve our efficiency, without sacrificing the quality of our work product and without sacrificing some of the privacy that we have baked into the system.

And I don't see another solution myself — and maybe I'm missing something. But it would seem to me that in order to do that much more with the same number of person-hours, we are going to have to really think deeply about how to leverage some of this technology. To a certain extent, some of that is already happening.

But I think where this is going is: okay, what tools, and how? What tools make sense? What kind of training do the judicial officers and the staff in the judiciary need to have in order to use those tools wisely? Where are the guardrails, so that we're not sacrificing the quality of our decision-making, we're not delegating our decision-making to the machine? That I don't think would be a good thing. That's not what people sign up for when they come to court. And there are machine decision-makers, and that's fine — but opting into that I see as a pretty important feature.

Colin Rule: [00:28:13] Yes. Transparency. I could not agree with you more. I think about this, again, from the dispute resolution field. My mission statement at ODR.com is to resolve the world's disputes through the use of information and communications technology. So then AI appears — it's a new technology. Well, just thinking about achieving the mission that I have, AI is an incredible asset, because we can expand the reach of what we do. We can reach many more people, at prices that are possible for them, as opposed to what we could do before.

So you'd think that's a good thing, but of course there's a lot of possible downsides. And obviously from the judicial context, it's the same thing. If you think the objective is providing fast, fair, and just resolutions to citizens, because that's an important part of civil society — well, you can see how AI would be a great thing, right? Expanding the reach and opening the doors of the legal system, and having many, many more people get access to justice.

But we have to be cognizant of all of the potential downsides, and that's why I agree with you 100%: we gotta put guardrails in place to make sure we use these tools well. But in terms of achieving the objective of the justice system, hopefully when we learn to civilize this technology, it will become a huge boon to achieving the same objectives we had even back 100 years ago. The objectives haven't changed. The what hasn't changed, but the how has changed.

Stacy Guillon: [00:29:33] That's exactly right, and I see enormous opportunity in the new how. Given what I do, so much of what I do is information processing. And some of that is on the case management side. I see huge opportunity for more automation on the case management side, in a way that would not involve any substantive decision-making. It's just: how do we get to me the information that I need to know when I sit down at my desk? What am I gonna do today? Who needs me the most? What are the cases that are coming

up, and what do I need to do in those cases? How do we get the filings to me that have been input in the system without spending an enormous amount of person-hours doing that?

And then on the substantive side, research is something at which AI, if properly trained, can really excel. And so, how can I get my hands on the best possible information quickly about what other judges have done, in order to make my decisions? Those to me seem like places where AI could make huge positive impacts.

Colin Rule: [00:30:35] Well, and to think about you as a judge sitting in your chair — if there was sort of a cloud of AI assistants who were doing all of that work, sorting through all the information that was coming in, doing the research, and then providing all the information that you require to do the most human and important task of actually making the decision — I think everybody would be comfortable with that vision of a future, of where things are headed with these AIs.

Stacy Guillon: [00:31:03] Well, and that's the hard... I think there are sort of two things that come to mind. One is, what information do I need, and what information are we screening out? You're exactly right — that's gonna be a huge piece.

The next piece is gonna be security and privacy, and the things that the private sector worries about, too, and our courts worry about too. And the last piece, I think, which is somewhat unique to the judiciary, is going to be public trust and confidence in the legal system.

It's so important. The thing I think about the most during the day, as I'm making my decisions, is that I need to create and implement a process that assures all of the parties before me that the process is fair. They might not like the outcome — judges declare winners and losers, that's part of my job. But it's so important to me that I am doing everything I can to help people believe and see that the process is fair. That's something that I think AI could undermine if we don't do this well, and so that, from my perspective, is pretty unique to the judiciary.

Colin Rule: [00:32:12] Well, Stacy, I think that's a great place to leave it. Your commitment to public service in your role shines through in everything that you're saying, so Colorado is very lucky to have you on the bench. I can't thank you enough for taking the time today, and hopefully this is the first of many conversations. It'll be interesting to see five, 10 years out — maybe we can set a date in our Outlook and look back and see how the judiciary was changed by all of these tools. But I really appreciate you taking the time for the conversation today.

Stacy Guillon: [00:32:41] Oh, Colin, I'm so grateful to you. I'm so pleased that minds as great as yours are devoted to the problems of our legal system — to making it better and fairer and more efficient, and getting people the resolutions that they need.

Colin Rule: [00:32:56] The Court ODR Podcast is brought to you by ODR.com. To learn more about ODR.com products and services, please visit us at ODR.com.